



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,088	01/13/2004	Ashley Carl Torr	1-16438	3080

7590 02/07/2007  
Attention: Mark A. Hixon, Esq.  
Marshall & Melhorn, LLC  
8TH FLOOR  
FOUR SEAGATE  
TOLEDO, OH 43604

EXAMINER
----------

LAZORCIK, JASON L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1731

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/756,088

Applicant(s)

TORR ET AL.

Examiner

Jason L. Lazorcik

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION:

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 30 through 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the reference to "operating at a quench pressure" fails to establish a sufficient relationship between the glass material and the method of processing steps to be considered enabling for one of ordinary skill. Similarly, the reference to "quench pressure" without supporting structural details of the tempering equipment fails to permit one of ordinary skill to make or use the invention without undue experimentation.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner has found no supporting basis for

Applicants recited limitation wherein the tempering operation is carried out under such conditions as required to achieve "ANSI Z26" standards in the application as originally.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 30 through 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. Simply declaring a relative quench pressure in the manner set forth in claim 31, while providing a relative measure of a physical state between two methods, imparts no patentable weight in the absence of a related apparatus or a quantitative value of pressure. The omission of the structural cooperative relationship between the operating pressure and the apparatus renders the particular metes and bounds of the instant claim unclear and indefinite.

Claims 30 through 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "standard ANSI Z26" in claims 30, 31, 38, and 39 is understood to encompass a national standard for tempered glazings at a given point in time, however this set of standards is understood to be subject to update and revision. Since the conditions embodied by term "ANSI Z26" understood to be variable with time, so too is the scope of a claim which recites said term as a limitation. For at least this reason, the particular metes and bounds of the identified claims are deemed to be unclear and indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 30 through 39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (WO 91/07356) in view of Littleton (2,311,846). Cheng relates a composition of soda-lime silica glass comprising:

1. From about 65 to about 75 weight percent SiO<sub>2</sub>
2. From about 10 to about 15 weight percent Na<sub>2</sub>O
3. From about 0 to 4 weight percent K<sub>2</sub>O
4. **From about 1 to 5 weight percent MgO**
5. From about 5 to 15 weight percent CaO
6. From about 0 to about 3 weight percent Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>

Art Unit: 1731

7. "A total amount of Iron in the batch ...equal from 0.7% to about 1.25% by weight, expressed as  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$ ... the degree of reduction is critical and must equal between 23 and 29%." (pg 11, Lines 9 to 13)
8. From about 0.02 to 0.85 weight percent  $\text{TiO}_2$

The family of glass compositions with constituent ingredients as set forth above, overlapping a composition (Composition I) as set forth in the applicants specification (pg 7, lines 20-31), is understood to define at least one soda-lime silica glass composition which inherently possess all of the physical properties of applicants said Composition I as set forth in the specification (Pg 8, lines 1-4). **The above composition which does not recite a concentration of boron is understood to be effectively "boron-free" by omission. Further, the disclosed concentration of magnesium oxide ( $\text{MgO}$ ) of about 1 to 5 weight percent is understood to directly read upon the claimed magnesium oxide concentration of "less than 2% by weight".** As such, it would be obvious to fabricate at least one silica glass composition according to the Cheng compositional ratios which possess a thermal expansion coefficient,  $\alpha$ , of  $98.9 \times 10^{-7} \text{ } ^\circ\text{C}^{-1}$  and a fracture toughness of  $0.66 \text{ MPam}^{1/2}$ . Applicant also defines a benchmark standard for comparison or the "standard composition" of glass referred to as OPTIKOOL™ 371 having a thermal expansion coefficient,  $\alpha$ , of  $92.4 \times 10^{-7}$ . Applicant further indicates that a sample according to Composition 1 requires 8 kPa of cooling pressure to achieve ECE R43 standards versus the "standard composition" requirement of 17 kPa or higher (pg 14, Lines 1-14).

Cheng fails to explicitly indicate that the disclosed glass would require a given quenching pressure during a tempering process or that the given quenching pressure would be 20% less than that required for a "standard composition". However according to the applicants disclosure (pg 14, Lines 1-14), the Composition 1 outlined above requires approximately 47% (8kPa/ 17kPa) of the required quenching pressure to achieve the "required standards" when compared to the "standard composition". **It is therefore understood that Cheng's composition, inherently having the same physical properties of the applicants glass, would likewise inherently require 20% less quench pressure than is required by the "standard composition" to achieve a temper in accord with the "required standards" or in the instant case the standards according to ANSI Z26.**

Accepting that the Cheng glass would inherently require a quench pressure 20% less than the "standard composition", the Littleton disclosure provides further insight into the governing relationship between the properties of a glass composition and the chilling conditions or quenching conditions required to achieve a given degree of temper. Littleton indicates that,

**"the degree of temper obtained under specific chilling conditions is controlled primarily by the thermal expansion coefficient of the glass from which an article is made although the thermal conductivity, the thickness of the glass, and its shape are also factors of somewhat lesser importance. The higher the expansion coefficient of the glass, the greater will be the degree of temper of the article and the lower the**

Art Unit: 1731

expansion coefficient, the lesser will be the degree of temper for a like treatment.”

Littleton teaches a direct functional relationship between the thermal expansion coefficient (TEC) and the degree of temper realized in a glass sheet under set quenching conditions. Specifically, a high TEC yields a high temper while a low TEC yields a low temper holding all other variables equivalent in a given temper process. Applicant teaches that the inventive composition has a higher TEC (e.g.  $98.9\text{E-}7/\text{C}$  versus  $92.4\text{E-}7/\text{C}$ ) and requires a lower quench pressure than the “standard composition” (e.g. 8kPa versus 17kPa). In effect, Applicant has provided an experimental evidence for the functional relationship set forth by Littleton.

In other words, since Applicants composition has a higher TEC, it requires a lower quench pressure or less severe quenching conditions to achieve the same level of temper as the standard composition with a lower TEC. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize the potential economic benefits for both operating costs as well as capital investment costs to be realized by producing a tempered glass product at a lower quench pressure (e.g. lower utilities costs and less robust equipment). Therefore one of ordinary skill with the Littleton teachings in hand would naturally seek a glass with a lower TEC over a glass with a high TEC holding other physical variables substantially equivalent.



With these points in mind, Cheng teaches a narrow range of glass compositions which reads directly upon Applicants claimed glass composition, however Cheng is silent regarding performing a tempering operation upon said glass. Since the Cheng glass reads upon Applicants composition, the prior art composition is understood to inherently provide every physical property of the Applicants claimed composition. Specifically, the Cheng glass would inherently provide a TEC substantially equivalent to that claimed by the Applicant which is, by Applicants own admission, higher than the TEC of the “standard composition” of glass. It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill, appreciating the relationship between TEC and temper as taught by Littleton, to utilize the glass composition as taught by Cheng.

Further, “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.”; see *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). A particular parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable, i.e., a variable which achieves a recognized result, before the determination of the optimum or workable ranges of said variable might be characterized as routine experimentation (See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) and *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977)). In the instant case, the degree of temper in a glass sheet is a direct function of the TEC and the tempering conditions. Therefore degree of temper is deemed a result-effective variable of method of tempering a glass article. Since

Art Unit: 1731

**optimization of this result effective variable would be undertaken through routine experimentation, the immediate claim wherein “operating at a quench pressure 20% less than the quench pressure required to temper a corresponding glazing of standard composition to standard ANSI Z26” is obvious over the prior art.**

**Restated, one of ordinary skill in the art, aware of the requisite regional standards (e.g. ANSI Z26) and recognizing the relationship between tempering conditions, the TEC of the glass material, and the degree of temper required by these standards, would arrive at a set of quenching conditions 20% less than the level utilized for a glass of standard composition through simple empirical optimization.**

Regarding Claim 31, the above rejection of Claim 30 indicates that the Cheng glass composition would require approximately 47% of the quench pressure of the “standard composition” which is read as at least 25% less than the quench pressure required to temper a corresponding glazing of standard composition.

With respect to Claim 32, Cheng indicates (Pg 5, Lines 17-18) that the disclosed glass may be utilized for “a nominal glass thickness of 3 to 5mm” and that “the glass sheets for windshield use are of a thickness in the range of from about 1.7 to about 2.5mm” (Pg 6, Lines 11-15). Cheng further indicates that the glass sheets of the disclosed invention may be made via a float glass process (Pg 8, Lines 27-28).

Claim 33 is rendered obvious in light of the rejection of Claim 30 above where the quench pressure for the Cheng glass would inherently be 8 kPa or “not more than 12.5 kPa” for approximately 3 mm glass.

Claim 34 is rendered obvious in light of the rejection of Claim 30 above where the quench pressure for the Cheng glass would inherently be 8 kPa or “not more than 10 kPa” for approximately 3 mm glass.

Claim 35 is rendered obvious in light of the rejection of Claim 30 above where the Cheng glass was shown to inherently possess a thermal expansion greater than  $93 \times 10^{-7}$  oC<sup>-1</sup> and a Fracture toughness of less than 0.72 MPam<sup>1/2</sup> and the quench pressure required for the Cheng glass would inherently be 8 kPa or “not more than 10 kPa” for approximately 3 mm glass.

Regarding Claims 36 and 37 and with particular reference to the disclosure of Littleton in the Claim 30 rejection above, Littleton asserts

**“The degree of temper obtained under specific chilling conditions is controlled primarily by the thermal expansion coefficient of the glass from which an article is made although the thermal conductivity, the thickness of the glass, and its shape are also factors of somewhat lesser importance.”**

In light of the argument set forth in the Claim 30 rejection above, the thickness of the glass sheet will dictate the degree of temper obtained for a given set of chilling conditions or a given “quench pressure”. Given the relationship between thickness and resultant temper, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the quench pressure through routine experimentation while holding all other variables constant in order to optimize the resultant temper in the sheet of glass.

Art Unit: 1731

Claim 38 is rejected as being obvious in light of the relevant portions of the rejection of Claim 30 above and the following. Specifically, the rejection of Claim 30 above sets forth a glass composition comprising at least 14.5% by weight  $\text{Na}_2\text{O}$ , at least 10.5% by weight  $\text{CaO}$ , at least 0.5% by weight total iron and being "substantially" magnesium free where 1-5%  $\text{MgO}$  is understood as being 95% to 99% magnesium free or "substantially magnesium free". Also as indicated in the rejection of Claim 30, it would be obvious to operate the tempering procedure at a quench pressure at least 10% less than the quench pressure of a glass sheet of "standard composition". Regarding the instant claim, Cheng does not explicitly indicate that the degree of reduction of the iron or "ferrous value (% ferrous) (should be) of at least 30%". However, the immediate reference does indicate that more highly reduced iron (eg above 29%) would cause the visible light transmittance to drop below 70% (pg11, Lines 18-20). It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art seeking to produce "tinted" windows with a light transmittance below 70% in the process as set forth by Cheng to increase the relative percentage of reduced iron in the glass melt to above 30% as discussed.

Claim 30 is rejected as being obvious in light of the arguments set forth in the rejections of Claim 30 and Claim 38 as presented above.

Claim 40 is obvious in light of the rejection of claim 30 above wherein the total weigh percent of alkali metal oxide is understood to be approximately 10 to 19% ( $\text{Na}_2\text{O}$  +  $\text{K}_2\text{O}$ ) and the total weight percent of alkaline earth metal oxide oxide (Other than  $\text{MgO}$ ) is understood to be 5 to 15 % based on the concentration of  $\text{CaO}$ .

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 27, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Specifically, Applicant argues that Cheng does not disclose a tempering process and Littleton does not disclose tempering a "boron-free glass having a MgO content of <2% by weight. Applicant continues by asserting that neither of the references considered independently of the other renders the limitations of the instant claim obvious. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The argument suggesting no motivation to combine the Cheng and Littleton disclosures is found unpersuasive. Briefly, Littleton teaches that a high TEC glass requires a relatively low quenching condition (e.g. "quench pressure") to achieve a given temper state when compared to a low TEC glass. Littleton further teaches tempering operations performed upon glass compositions that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize as overlapping with the Cheng glass compositions (e.g. Littleton Composition F, Table 1). Cheng teaches a glass composition inherently providing a low TEC compared to the "standard composition" of glass. One of ordinary skill, aware of the Littleton teachings, would find ample motivation to utilize the high TEC glass such as disclosed by Cheng in order to reduce operating costs or to "operate at a lower quench pressure" as claimed.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1731


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason L. Lazorcik whose telephone number is (571) 272-2217. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLL

  
STEVEN P. GRIFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Application/Control Number: 10/756,088

Page 15

Art Unit: 1731